

Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – Expedited Procedure

Serial No.: 10/023,542

Examiner: Asghar H. Bilgrami

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-20 remain in this application, with claims 1, 10 and 14 being independent claims.

In the outstanding official action, independent claims 1, 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al (US Publication 2002/0161917) and Nataraj et al (US Patent 6,757,779). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Regarding independent claims 1, 10 and 14, neither Shapiro nor Nataraj, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination disclose, teach, or render obvious the use of a “dynamic routing protocol” such as illustrated by the example described in the detailed description of the present invention on page 10 line 26 – page 13 line 33. Nataraj describes the use of a static or non changing routing protocol (col. 1, lines 32-52). As such, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 2-9, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 1 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over the cited references, and request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 11-13, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 10, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 10 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 10, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over the cited references, and request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 15-20, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 14, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 14 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over the cited references, and request that these rejections be withdrawn.

It is believed that the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejection of

134065

Page 6

## Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – Expedited Procedure


Serial No.: 10/023,542

Examiner: Asghar H. Bilgrami

claims 1-20 as set forth in the Office Action, and full allowance of same. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

ALCATEL

  
Craig A. Hoersten  
Reg. No. 38,917Dated: 1-12-06

Alcatel  
Intellectual Property Department  
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2  
Plano, TX 75075  
Phone: (972) 519-5143  
Fax: (972) 477-9328